

I affirm

Single standard: Ecocentrism

Ecocentrism helps solve environmental crisis and pushing us away from human first thinking

Kopnina et Al 2017 [Cryer, Paul, Kopnina, Helen, Piccolo, John J., Taylor, Bron, Washington, Haydn](https://mahb.stanford.edu/blog/statement-ecocentrism/) July 4, 2017
<https://mahb.stanford.edu/blog/statement-ecocentrism/> [Wrench]

"We believe that **ecocentrism, through its recognition of humanity's duties towards nature, is central to solving our unprecedented environmental crisis. Its importance is for multiple reasons:** In ethical terms: **ecocentrism expands the moral community (and ethics) from being just about ourselves. It means we are not concerned only with humanity; we extend respect and care to all life, and indeed to terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems themselves.** In evolutionary terms: **ecocentrism reflects the fact *Homo sapiens* evolved out of the rich web of life on Earth** – a legacy stretching back an almost unimaginable 3.5 billion years. **Other species literally are our cousins and relatives** (close and distant), **recognition of a biological kinship that many have recognized confers moral responsibilities toward all species.** In spiritual terms: **Many people and some societies have developed ecocentric moral sentiments. There is increasing evidence that ecocentric values are being fused into nature-based, ecocentric spiritualities, many of which are innovative and new.** With such spiritualities, even people who are entirely naturalistic in their worldviews, often speak of the Earth and its ecosystems as 'sacred' and thus worthy of reverent care and defense. In ecological terms: **ecocentrism reminds us that all life is interdependent and that both humans and nonhumans are absolutely dependent on the ecosystem processes that nature provides.**"

A human first or anthropocentric worldview abdicates us of our moral responsibility to prevent ecocide and species extinction

Kopnina, 16 (Helen, PhD, researcher and lecturer at The Hague University of Applied Science, "Nobody Likes Dichotomies (But Sometimes You Need Them)," Anthropological Forum, 2016) <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00664677.2016.1243515> //cb
Anthropocentric Bias An anthropocentric bias extends to poaching and to dislocation, since critics of conservation do not discuss non-human displacements or indeed colonisation in a broader sense. **The defining characteristic of 'colonisation' in general, along with the increase of social inequalities, is the ever-greater instrumentalism in human engagements with non-human inhabitants** (Strang 2016). **This entails the self-proclaimed right to undermine another species' very existence and the evolutionary unfolding in the noble quest for social justice** (Kopnina 2012a, 2012b, 2014a; Cafaro and Primack 2014), in effect **condoning 'nonhuman genocide'** (Crist 2012, 140). **Accusations that conservationists are 'out of control' to save the near-extinct species** (Büscher 2015) **testifies to a robust anthropocentric bias, and a refusal to acknowledge the legal repercussions of ecocide** (Higgins 2010). **The perpetuation of social inequality and the increasing extinctions of non-human species fundamentally alter the ethics of anthropological practice. These ethics are subject to value judgements – of what or who is accorded rights, and in what proportion.** Caplan (2003) has argued that **extreme cultural relativity** (in which it is possible, for example, to

ignore major abuses of human rights) is an abdication of moral responsibility. By the same token, presenting even the concern over loss of biodiversity as a social construction of sentimental elites, or by profit-seeking neo-colonial regimes, **abdicates moral responsibility to non-humans**. The proponents of social justice keep perpetuating the dichotomies between the indigenous communities and the Western elites (e.g. Chapin 2004), or between poor rural peasants and neoliberal conservationists (e.g. Holmes 2013). However, historically, protected areas were rarely created to benefit particular groups of people (such as tourists), because most national parks have been established for the people, everywhere in the world, and not just in post-colonial nations (e.g. Doak et al. 2015). In fact, national parks can be seen as protecting cultural identity against severe changes to the local environment, such as logging. As Brosius (1999, 39) has noted in the case of Penan in Malaysia, 'logging not only undermines the basis of Penan subsistence but, by transforming sites with biographical, social, and historical significance, also destroys those things that are iconic of their existence as a society'. Conservation does not threaten people's liberty, as Fletcher (2009) would have it – rather it **enables one to live in a world of natural richness**. In the words of Wakild (2015, 44):

Onto the Contention Level

The sole contention is Moon Mining by Private Entities

A: The globe is increasing lunar investments. We will isolate 2 scenarios:

Scenario 1: Europe

Jamasmie 2019 [Cecilia Jamasmie "Mining the Moon Ready to Lift off by 2025." MINING.COM, Mar. 2019, www.mining.com/mining-moon-ready-lift-off-2025/. Accessed 1 Jan. 2022] Wrench.

European scientists have announced plans to start mining the moon as early as 2025, though what they'll be extracting is neither gold nor diamonds, but waste-free nuclear energy thought to be worth trillions of dollars. The goal is to place a lander on the lunar surface to mine and process regolith for water, oxygen, metals and an isotope called **helium-3**, which may prove useful for fueling future fusion reactors. Regolith, Universe Today reported, is a dust-like material that covers the lunar surface and is the result of billions of years of meteor and comet impacts. If anyone ever lives on the moon, they could use the regolith to build habitats for a base.

Scenario 2: US has issued public grants to private institutions ramping up lunar development

Gohd 2021 Gohd, Chelsea. "NASA Just Cut a 10-Cent Check to Kick-Start Moon Mining Tech." Space.com, Space, 30 Aug. 2021, www.space.com/nasa-lunar-outpost-check-moon-resources. Accessed 1 Jan. 2022.

NASA has cut a 10 cent **check to space startup Lunar Outpost in the first-ever payment to a company to mine the moon**. NASA Administrator Bill Nelson presented Justin Cyrus, CEO of Colorado-based space startup Lunar Outpost, with the first payment ever issued to a company as part of a space resource contract announced Aug. 23 here at the 36th annual Space Symposium.

B: Space is the final economic frontier- opens up new lanes of commerce and exploitation

US Government publishing Office 2021 [Us Government Publishing Office January 2021 con. Rept.

2021 - Chapter 8: Exploring New Frontiers in Space Policy and Property Rights Accessed 1/8/2021 <https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/ERP-2021/pdf/ERP-2021-chapter8.pdf>] Wrench

The United States has been on the cutting edge of space exploration since the dawn of the space age and has become the world leader in commercial activity in space. In the 20th century, the United States became the first and only nation to send individuals to the Moon. After the end of the Apollo Program, the United States pioneered the Space Shuttle, the world's first reusable spacecraft. Now American engineers have become the first to demonstrate and operationalize the capabilities of commercial spacecraft for orbital cargo delivery, first-stage reusability, and human spaceflight. **In the 21st century, the United States has ushered in a new era of space exploration based on public-private partnerships and the success of private sector investment in space technologies.** The Trump Administration recognizes the opportunities and benefits afforded by **this new era and has advanced policies that encourage private sector innovation, collaboration with commercial companies, and a regulatory environment more conducive to investment in space. In doing so, this Administration is not only accelerating the development of the today's space industry; it is also laying the foundation for a viable space economy that can continue to develop and expand in the coming decades.** This past year has seen historic advances in spaceflight and space policy, even in the midst of the global COVID-19 pandemic. After the reestablishment of USSPACECOM as a combatant command for the space domain on August 19, 2019, President Trump established the U.S. Space Force (USSF), the sixth branch of the U.S. military, on December 20, 2019. The mission of USSF is to organize, train, and equip space forces to "protect U.S. and allied interests in space and to provide space capabilities to the joint force" (USSF n.d.). In addition, on May 30, 2020, and November 15, 2020, in major milestones for the partnership between the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and the private sector, **SpaceX launched a total of six astronauts from Cape Canaveral to the International Space Station** (ISS). **These missions, which represent the first commercial human spaceflights in history, are an important step for the private sector's role in the space economy.**

C: Economic growth and its effects is the root of environmental disaster

Phys, 16 - citing a study by Roberto Cazzolla Gatti, associate professor in ecology and biodiversity at Tomsk State University ("Western lifestyle spells the end of biodiversity," *Phys.org*, 4-5-2016, <https://phys.org/news/2016-04-western-lifestyle-biodiversity.html>)

Contrary to what many economists suggest, development is not always good for nature, a biologist at Tomsk State University argues. It is broadly accepted that biodiversity and the ecosystem are both fundamental to sustaining humanity and life on Earth, but in recent centuries, they have been subject to heavy pressures due to overexploitation. Environmental protection is also raising concerns because of our improved understanding of the interconnections between human wellness and ecosystem health. "The problem is that, even if the will to follow a sustainable lifestyle in Western countries is increasing, many developing countries are experiencing economic growth, which threatens to subject their environments to overexploitation," writes Roberto Cazzolla Gatti, associate professor in ecology and biodiversity at Tomsk State University in "Trends in human development and environmental protection," a paper published in the International Journal of Environmental Studies. This could be a catastrophe for the planet. This study compares the trends seen in the Living Planet Index (LPI) and the Human Development Index (HDI) and applies an economic-ecologic historical analysis. The TSU ecologist suggests that societies follow common development patterns as they move from an indigenous lifestyle to an undeveloped society before entering a transitional phase as they move toward a developed

state. As they go through this process, **each society exploits local, regional and sometimes global natural resources to nourish its economic growth.** "Today, we can see that higher-latitude countries populated by 2 billion people consume their entire environmental capital in one year, while lower-latitude countries that are home to more than 5 billion people are depleting resources at a growing rate that will in a few years catch up with Western levels," Cazzolla Gatti says. "If developing countries do not implement strategies to skip this 'intermediate' stage of natural resource overuse during the intense growth phase, the **Earth's systems will not be able to support the global biodiversity and ecosystems that sustain humanity.** The planet is facing a series of challenges that could lead to a significant loss of ecosystem integrity. These challenges are caused by human demand, natural resource and space use. The recent agreement signed at the United Nations climate summit in Paris (December 2015) has been hailed as historic, ground-breaking and unprecedented. However, the targets it sets seem so ambitious that many climate analysts do not believe they will have any impact on the current climatic situation. This agreement aims to limit temperature increases to a level below 2° C, above pre-industrial levels, and recognizes that avoiding 1.5° C of warming "would significantly reduce the risks and impacts of climate change." Unfortunately, participating countries' emissions reduction commitments are not sufficient to achieve these targets and it seems impossible to avoid the 1.5°C limit without development of "negative emissions," such as absorbing carbon dioxide out of the air using technologies that are still at worst unavailable and at best ineffective. "In addition to climate change, **the major cause of the reduction in biodiversity we have seen in recent times is the associated rates of habitat destruction and degradation.** Over half of the estimated original extent of temperate broadleaf forests had already been converted to agriculture, forest plantations and urban areas by 1950," Cazzolla Gatti writes. "In contrast, deforestation and land-use change accelerated in the tropics after 1950. **Freshwater ecosystem exploitation has moved well beyond levels that can be sustained, even at current demand.** Moreover, forecasts suggest that **demand for water will continue to rise globally.** Add to this the impact of the increasing global **demand for palm oil products, which continues to be a key factor behind the recent dramatic decline in forest cover** in Southeast Asia," Gatti says. "Data suggests that two orangutan species have already undergone a tenfold decrease in population size over the 20th century and many populations are now at very low numbers. Looking at the marine environment, **the high demand for fish and fish products combined with overcapacity in the global fishing fleet and inefficient fishing techniques have led to massive overfishing.**" This alarming study suggests that **societies seem to follow common development patterns and few countries are currently living sustainably, with the majority overexploiting natural resources and ecosystems. This is fundamentally unsustainable and there is no end in sight.** Moving away from this will be anything but painless. In coming years, 5 to 7 billion people will follow the global patterns described in this study, and **ecosystems and biodiversity will continue to be subjected to a high level of stress with no assurance of resilience.**

Loss of biodiversity outweighs; its damage is to the environment is irreparable

Tobin, '00 (Richard, professor of political science at SUNY-Buffalo, *The Expendable Future*, p. 22

Norman Meyers observes, **no other form of environmental degradation "is anywhere so significant as the fallout of species."** Harvard biologist Edward O. Wilson is less modest in assessing the relative consequences of human-caused extinctions. To Wilson, **the worst thing that will happen to earth is not economic collapse, the depletion of energy supplies, or even nuclear war.** As frightful as these events might be, Wilson reasons that **they can "be repaired within a few generations. The one process ongoing...that will take millions of years to correct is the loss of genetic and species diversity by destruction of natural habitats.**

Extinction of one species leads to a domino effect destroying ecosystems

Noseworthy 14 – forester and conservation biologist working in the Atlantic Region for the Nature Conservancy of Canada (Josh, "The Jenga theory of biodiversity: The tipping point of ecosystems and the diversity of species"

<http://www.natureconservancy.ca/en/blog/the-jenga-theory-of.html>)–

With only 20 seconds left of a roughly seven-minute interview, I ended up using a metaphor of Jenga – that surprisingly simple game that gives you just enough anxiety to make it fun. I described how **each species can be seen as a block in the tower.** If you take a block out (representing species extinction) it might not make the tower fall, but **it does make it weaker.** **Every block removed increases the chances** of the tower **collapsing** by taking away the support of the

blocks that remain, and also by shifting the balance of the tower as a whole. After a while **it doesn't take much to knock the whole thing down**. The final blow might be the removal of that all-important block, or it might be caused by outside forces — a wobbly table, a heavy breather, or maybe just a fault in one of the blocks that went unnoticed. The **resilience**

Of the Jenga tower **becomes increasingly compromised**, and everyone sitting around the table knows that someone will eventually be responsible for a disorderly pile of blocks (amidst squeals of delighted laughter by those that aren't responsible, of course). Sea otter, Vancouver Aquarium (Photo by Wikimedia Commons, Stan Shebs) Sleeping sea otter at the Vancouver Aquarium (Photo by Wikimedia Commons, Stan Shebs) Probably the most well known "block" relevant to the topic of biodiversity is the sea otter. The "tower" that the Sea otter supported was the kelp forest ecosystem of Pacific North America. After being driven close to extinction by early European explorers, the lack of sea otters allowed sea urchins, their favourite food, to explode in numbers, which in turn caused the disappearance of the kelp forests. Sea urchins munched these kelp beds into oblivion since the otters weren't around to control the urchin population, which then resulted in the disappearance of all the other marine life that depended on the kelp beds as habitat, from shrimp to whales. We know this because fortunately, remnant populations of sea otters were discovered before it was too late, and the impacts of their reintroduction to their natural habitat were recorded. After putting the otters back, the rich kelp forest ecosystem with all its diversity of creatures began to return (albeit slowly), including those that are commercially important for people (we're just another block, after all). On the island of Mauritius in the Indian Ocean, previously home to the infamous dodo bird, there was once a species of 600-pound tortoise. The story goes that when Dutch sailors first arrived on the island in 1638 there were so many tortoises that they could walk exclusively on the turtles' backs without touching the ground (a bit of a stretch most likely, but you get the idea). Then they ate them all — every last one. The extinction did not seem to have any obvious impacts on the surrounding ecosystem, until in the 1970s researchers began to notice that the native tree species (which can live for centuries) were not reproducing and were becoming threatened by extinction. If the trees were lost, so would be the insect pollinators, the birds that fed on their foliage, the bats that roosted in their branches and the orchids that grew in their canopies. After some frantic research, it turned out those trees needed their fruit to pass through the gut of a tortoise in order to germinate. No tortoise, no trees. In a desperate and controversial attempt to reverse the decline, a similar species of tortoise was relocated from a nearby island with some promising results. Although there are still no guarantees of success due to the unknowns surrounding the ecology of both the tortoise and the tree species, it goes to show how **the removal of a seemingly unnecessary block could have huge**

repercussions down the road. Whether the impacts of extinction happen right away or centuries later, they will undoubtedly happen. No species stands alone, and the loss of one will always have some form of impact on others, often in a chain reaction. We've only scratched the surface of discovering the interconnectedness within ecosystems; in many cases we know nothing at all. What we do know however, is that at the end of the day **resilient ecosystems** — those that are best suited to remain stable and continuously provide us with goods and services — are the ones that **maintain their full diversity**.

Attacks on the neg